

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
AT CLARKSBURG

MICHAEL JACKSON,
on behalf of himself and
all others similarly situated,
Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 1:24-cv-80

WHITEPAGES, INC.,
Defendant.

MICHAEL JACKSON,
on behalf of himself and
all others similarly situated,
Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 1:24-cv-81

LEXISNEXIS RISK
SOLUTIONS, INC.,

Defendant.

MICHAEL JACKSON,
on behalf of himself and
all others similarly situated,
Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 1:24-cv-88

THOMSON REUTERS
AMERICA CORP.,

Defendant.

MICHAEL JACKSON,
on behalf of himself and
all others similarly situated,
Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 1:24-cv-96

THRYV, Inc.

Defendant.

MICHAEL JACKSON,
on behalf of himself and
all others similarly situated,
Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 1:24-cv-102

PEOPLECONNECT, INC., et al.

Defendants.

ORDER

This matter is before the court on a consolidated motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim filed by each of the defendants in the above-captioned cases. Plaintiff Michael Jackson filed class action complaints against these defendants alleging violations of Section E of a West Virginia statute known as Daniel's Law. For the reasons stated in the accompanying memorandum opinion, the court finds that Section E of West Virginia's Daniel's Law is a content-based restriction of speech subject to strict scrutiny. Although Section E of West Virginia's Daniel's Law serves a compelling state interest, Section E is not narrowly tailored because it lacks a notice or knowledge requirement. Thus, Section E of West Virginia's

Daniel's Law is unconstitutional on its face, and the motion to dismiss must be **GRANTED**.

Each of the above-captioned cases shall be closed and stricken from the active docket of the court.

It is so **ORDERED**.

Entered: *08-18-2025*



Michael F. Urbanski
Senior United States District Judge